



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,742	12/28/2000	John W. Marshall	SSB0001-US	5548
27510	7590	07/29/2004	EXAMINER	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 607 14TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			DINH, MINH	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2132		

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/749,742	MARSHALL ET AL.
	Examiner Minh Dinh	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/5/2001</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: insert “to or” after “application” (5th line). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Zeichick (“Content Security – Keep Your Users Safe... And Focused – Three software packages aim to keep your employee’s eyes front and center”).

- a. Regarding claim 1, Zeichick discloses a method comprising:
implementing a security software application in an electronic messaging system with connection to a data network (p. 3, “Symantec’s Norton AniVirus ... NAV works to stop it at that point.”);
providing a local configuration of the security software application on a local messaging terminal, wherein the local configuration includes a list of at least one known

malicious application (p. 4, "A key element of NAV ... locally to NAV Corporate clients.");

detecting an electronic message received or to be sent by a local messaging terminal (p. 3, "Symantec's Norton AniVirus ... NAV works to stop it at that point.");

determining whether the electronic message includes any attachment (p. 4, "Now that the servers ... Mail 8.0 and 8.1.");

if an attachment is included with the electronic message, using the security software application to check the attachment for any malicious application based on the list of at least one known malicious application (p. 4, "Now that the servers ... and it did so.");

refreshing the local configuration of the security software application from a globally replicated public folder within the electronic messaging system on a desired periodic basis (p. 4, ", "A key element of NAV ... once per day from the LiveUpdate server.").

b. Regarding claim 9, Zeichick further discloses that the local configuration of the security software application includes an option to set a time for the desired periodic basis to refresh the local configuration (p. 4, "A key element of NAV ... once per day from the LiveUpdate server.").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeichick as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "The University of Texas at Austin Chooses CA's InoculateIT to Protect Web Environment Against Virus Attacks".
 - a. Regarding claim 2, Zeichick does not disclose implementing an add-in software component to an electronic message client of the electronic messaging system. The "The University of Texas" reference discloses implementing an add-in software component to an electronic message client of an electronic messaging system (p. 2, "After evaluating several different ... the virus-free environment." and p.3, "To add yet another layer ... enter the school's email system."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Zeichick method to implement an add-in software component to an electronic message client of the electronic messaging system, as disclosed in the reference "The University of Texas", to provide more robust virus detection capabilities to the mail system.
 - b. Regarding claim 3, Zeichick further discloses that the electronic message client software resides in a host server (p. 4, "The downside with the ... Mail 8.0 and 8.1.").
7. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeichick as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ji et al. (5,889,943).

- a. Regarding claim 4, Zeichick does not disclose that the security software application includes a dynamic link library (DLL) application. Ji discloses a security software application includes a dynamic link library (DLL) application (col. 11, lines 38-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the Zeichick method such that the security software application includes a dynamic link library (DLL) application, as taught by Ji, to utilize a shared library.
- b. Regarding claim 5, Zeichick does not disclose prompting an error message on the local messaging terminal when the attachment to the electronic message matches a name on the list of the at least one known malicious application. Ji discloses alerting the recipient of an electronic message when an attachment to the electronic message contains a virus (col. 20, lines 48-63); Ji's teaching meets the limitation of the claim. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the Zeichick method to prompt an error message on the local messaging terminal when the attachment to the electronic message matches a name on the list of the at least one known malicious application, as taught by Ji, to alert the recipient.
- c. Regarding claim 6, Zeichick does not disclose blocking the matched attachment from being opened or sent. Ji discloses blocking the matched attachment from being opened (col. 12, lines 48-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the Zeichick method to block the matched attachment from being opened, as taught by Ji, so that the virus would not be activated.

8. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeichick as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Komiega ("Storage product prevents virus attacks").

a. Regarding claim 7, Zeichick does not explicitly disclose that the list of at least one known malicious application includes a list of known virus file names. Komiega discloses a list of known virus file names being utilized to block known virus files (p. 3, "Although FileScreen 2000 will ... block the file by its names"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Zeichick method to utilize a list of known virus file names, as taught by Komiega, in order to block known virus files.

b. Regarding claim 8, Zeichick discloses that the local configuration of the security software application includes an option to enable a checking of an attachment for any malicious application based on the list of at least one known malicious application (p. 4, "End users wishing to ... is needlessly complex.").

Zeichick does not disclose that the local configuration includes an option to add or remove a known malicious application from the list of at least one known malicious application and an option to restrict an attachment type. Komiega discloses an option to add a known malicious application to the list of at least one known malicious application files and an option to restrict an attachment type (p. 3, "Although FileScreen 2000 will ... block the file by its names"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Zeichick method such that the local configuration includes an option to add or remove a known malicious application

from the list of at least one known malicious application and an option to restrict an attachment type, as taught by Komiega, in order to provide options for blocking known virus files or certain attachment types that may contains a virus.

9. Claims 10, 13-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeichick in view of Komiega.

a. Regarding claim 10, Zeichick discloses a method comprising:
implementing a security software application in an electronic messaging system with connection to a data network (p. 3, "Symantec's Norton AniVirus ... NAV works to stop it at that point.");

providing a local configuration of the security software application on a local messaging terminal, wherein the local configuration includes a list of at least one known malicious application (p. 4, "A key element of NAV ... locally to NAV Corporate clients.");

detecting an electronic message received or to be sent by a local messaging terminal (p. 3, "Symantec's Norton AniVirus ... NAV works to stop it at that point.");

determining whether the electronic message includes any attachment (p. 4, "Now that the servers ... Mail 8.0 and 8.1.");

if an attachment is included with the electronic message, using the security software application to check the attachment for any malicious application based on the list of at least one known malicious application (p. 4, "Now that the servers ... and it did so.");

refreshing the local configuration of the security software application from a globally replicated public folder within the electronic messaging system on a desired periodic basis (p. 4, “, “A key element of NAV … once per day from the LiveUpdate server.”).

Zeichick does not disclose that the local configuration includes at least one application type. Komiega discloses a method for blocking e-mail attachments of one of executable application types included in a local configuration (p. 2, “According to David Hill … for use by an end user.” and p. 3, “W. Quinn’s FileScreen 2000 … to block the file by its file name”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the Zeichick method such that the local configuration includes at least one executable application type and the local configuration is used to block e-mail attachments of certain types, as taught by Komiega, so that users would not be allowed to receive e-mail attachments that have an extension that may contain a virus.

b. Regarding claim 13, Zeichick discloses that the local configuration of the security software application includes an option to enable a checking of an attachment for any malicious application based on the list of at least one known malicious application (p. 4, “End users wishing to … is needlessly complex.”). Zeichick does not disclose that the local configuration includes an option to add or remove an application type from the list of at least one application type and an option to enable a checking of an attachment for a restricted application type based on the list of at least one application type. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

modify the Zeichick method such that the local configuration includes an option to add or remove an application type from the list of at least one application type and an option to enable a checking of an attachment for a restricted application type based on the list of at least one application type, as taught by Komiega. Please refer to motivation recited for including at least one executable application type in the local configuration as taught by Komiega in claim 10.

- c. Claims 14-15 are rejected on the same basis as claim 10.
- d. Regarding claim 18, Zeichick further discloses that the local configuration of the security software application includes an option to set a time for the desired periodic basis to refresh the local configuration (p. 4, "A key element of NAV ... once per day from the LiveUpdate server.").

10. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeichick in view of Komiega as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of "The University of Texas at Austin Chooses CA's InoculateIT to Protect Web Environment Against Virus Attacks".

- a. Regarding claim 11, Zeichick does not disclose implementing an add-in software component to an electronic message client of the electronic messaging system. The "The University of Texas" reference discloses implementing an add-in software component to an electronic message client of an electronic messaging system (p. 2, "After evaluating several different ... the virus-free environment." and p.3, "To add yet another layer ... enter the school's email system."). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the Zeichick method to implement an add-in software component to an electronic message client of the electronic messaging system, as disclosed in the reference "The University of Texas", to provide more robust virus detection capabilities to the mail system.

b. Regarding claim 12, Zeichick further discloses that the electronic message client software resides in a host server (p. 4, "The downside with the ... Mail 8.0 and 8.1.").

11. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeichick in view of Komiega as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Ji. Zeichick and Komiega do not disclose that the list of at least one application type comprises application types not capable of containing malicious applications and that if the attachment is of one of the application types not capable of containing malicious applications, allowing the attachment to be opened or sent through the electronic messaging system. Ji discloses that the list of at least one application type comprises application types not capable of containing malicious applications and that if the attachment is of one of the application types not capable of containing malicious applications, allowing the attachment to be opened or sent through the electronic messaging system (col. 19, lines 45-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the combined method of Zeichick and Komiega such that that the list of at least one application type comprises application types not capable of containing malicious applications and that if the attachment is of one of the application types not capable of containing malicious

applications, allowing the attachment to be opened or sent through the electronic messaging system, as taught by Ji, to make the scanning process more efficient.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dinh whose telephone number is 703-306-5617.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri: 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MD

Minh Dinh
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

MD
7/21/2004

Justin Darrow
JUSTIN T. DARROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER